1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

586 in the open space of the village with shrill cries and shouts. The old man who has gone back to sit with his people, viz. those of the bridegroom, now springs to his feet and rushes upon Tembari with rage and indignation fairly flashing out of his eyes. The two performers in this very characteristic scene swerve and avoid one another with amazing skill. The old man is shouting that his wife did not cook for him nor look after his comfort and therefore deserved to be beaten. After one or two almost hair-raising dodges the two retire from the arena in the best of good humour, the old wife-beater's face covered with smiles.

The proceedings come to an end towards evening, when after a feast the several parties disperse. Neither bride nor bridegroom has borne a part of any importance. The former has for the most part been a spectator from a house verandah.

The martial demonstrations which have been described in the foregoing pages, especially the charge and counter-charge known as *esu*, are very commonly associated with the marriage payment, but they are by no means restricted to this occasion. Nor, on the other hand, is the marriage payment always accompanied by an *esu*. It is said that where villages are entirely friendly there will be no such seemingly hostile demonstration, and that the bridegroom's people may even take payment to the village of the bride. I do not know that the *esu* is ever performed at the acceptance of a *bi-dorobu*. The occasion above described is of course that of accepting an *a-dorobu*, or bride-price.

The Four Forms of Marriage

583 It remains to consider and compare the four forms of marriage, or the four methods of obtaining a mate, which were named in the beginning of the chapter. It will be understood that the following remarks refer to marriage as it obtains among the Orokaiva, and are not meant necessarily to apply to the usages of other primitive peoples.

583 Marriage by capture has been of very frequent occurrence. It was the practice in cannibal raids to kill and eat the men and the older women, but to make captives of any women who were sufficiently young and attractive. It is not to be

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

supposed that women and girls were always spared, for they sometimes met death in the heat of the moment. A very old man named Barepa enumerates ten victims of whom three were women. On the occasion of his first raid he was a mere boy, but in the scatter and pursuit he had captured a girl somewhat older than himself. When his people were mustering again he stood on the track holding her by the wrist. Up to that time he had been cherishing a youthful intention of keeping her till he should be of an age to marry, and when some of his elders laughingly said that she was too big for him and would escape he replied, 'Not she!' Next moment she had wrenched herself free and made off into the bush. Barepa gave chase, caught her, and dragging her back to the track deliberately killed her with a blow from a stone club, thereby showing his clansmen 'that he was not such a boy after all'. On another occasion he was holding a woman captive when she unexpectedly kicked him in the stomach and knocked him on to his back. Under this treatment Barepa's intentions suddenly changed and he sprang to his feet and clubbed the woman to death.

But instances in which the woman has been taken back to the raider's village and has settled down there as a wife are very common. For instance an Aiga man tells how his father and a friend had observed a Jeva Buje man in a canoe with his wife and daughter on the Kumusi. While the man remained in the canoe the two women had gone ashore to gather pandanus leaves. The two Aiga men stole upon them, clubbed the older woman and made off with the younger, while the father, hearing an uproar which he no doubt construed as a large attack, paddled for his life downstream in the direction of his village. The captive woman, who I believe still survives, became the mother of my informant.

An old woman of Sangara married originally a man of Wasida. She was subsequently captured by some of the Sauaha tribe and became the wife of a Sauaha man. In the course of a raid by Sangara upon Sauaha she was captured once more. In the confusion of flight she had leapt on a fallen log and screamed the name of her paternal uncle,

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

583 727 who was of course a Sangara man. One of the attackers, hearing the familiar name of his fellow tribesman, bore her back to her original village and married her. This old woman, captured, recaptured, and thrice married, was found living in contented old age with her third husband. But she said she had been well enough satisfied with each in turn and refused to express any retrospective preference.

Instances could be multiplied without making the matter clearer. A captive wife is called *jigari*, which simply means 'captive'. When, as in the usual instance, she is of another tribe, she is called *baira*, a 'stranger', though this word does not necessarily connote captivity as well.

Sometimes the captive wife was allowed to bring an infant with her, and it appears that both mother and child were well treated and settled down in their new surroundings. Buninia (who was mentioned as the husband of eleven wives) captured a woman and her young daughter. He kept the latter until she grew up and then found her attractive enough to marry also.

[518] Marriage by capture evidently did not always result in good feeling between the wife's people and the husband's. An elderly man who married his paternal uncle's widow (a captive) has never to this day visited her village, and avers that he is still afraid to do so. In another case an elderly woman never saw her people after being captured until the spread of Government control recently made it possible. Though, on the other hand, I have an instance in which the husband of a captive woman agreed to her warning her people of an impending attack; and in the [728] making of peace between tribes such women were the recognized emissaries. This points to the possibility of compensation for the capture which would follow on or be a condition to reconciliation between the tribes; though I am unable to give an instance of such tribal compensation.

583 628 In nearly all the cases of which I know, the captive woman has come from another tribe, rather than from another clan within the tribe. That is to say she has been taken as a true prisoner of war. But I have a few instances in which a woman has been captured or abducted from one clan by

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

any ceremonial necessity, other than that implied by revenge, which demanded a cannibal raid.

Cannibalism

The reason for cannibalism itself has been given by natives as the simple desire for good food. Indeed, we might profitably seek to explain why some people are *not* cannibals rather than why some people are. Anthropologically speaking the fact that we ourselves should persist in a superstitious, or at least sentimental, prejudice against human flesh is more puzzling than the fact that the Orokaiva, a born hunter, should see fit to enjoy perfectly good meat when he gets it. The aversion from cannibalism within the tribe is presumably to be ascribed to the same sentimental reason which, with a wider scope, turns us against human flesh in general. It was the custom to eat all victims made in an *isoro*, and they were only abandoned when the fear of counter-attack made the raiders leave in too great a hurry to be encumbered, or, as some informants have said, when the victims were so old, scraggy, and wrinkled as to be not worth the carrying.

When the victorious raiders returned they announced their success from afar off by a distinctive rhythm on the *hui* which (according to Aiga informants) may be represented thus:

— — - —, — — - — —.

There were conventional songs proper to the occasion, such as (an Aiga example),

Eruga tune *kambaja-one*
Eruga leaf seasoning
Isuga tune *kambaja-one*
Isuga leaf seasoning

by which the women were given to understand that they should prepare 'cabbage' for the cooking; or (a Sangara example)

Umo tibue kiari-ta koiko-ta,

which indicated that the enemy had fled (*koiko*), anxious to see (*kiari*) the familiar place where they drew water (*umo*

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

727 *tibu*). The men who had not themselves secured victims
533 would sing (another Sangara example),

U sina nane arako, u sina nane,

'Mine was like a water-fight', by which they meant that they had fought as ineffectually as children bathing and splashing one another with water.

727 The corpses of grown men were tied by hands and feet
482 to a pole and carried face downward. In the case of a child one hand was tied to one foot, and a warrior would sling the body over his shoulder as a hunter might a wallaby's. Usually, perhaps always, the victim was dead before he was bound in this manner.

An ingenious, if gruesome, method of carrying human flesh was actually observed by a former Resident Magistrate in the Division.

'The limbs had been peculiarly treated. The ankle-joints had been severed, leaving the tendon Achilles intact. The bones of the leg had then been excised, and the pelvical bone removed. The ham had been neatly cut off. The boneless leg was wrapped carefully round a three-foot stick, and the foot secured to the stick by a piece of vine. In this manner the flesh could be carried comfortably on one's back.'[1]

727 Informants have said that no captives except desirable women, and sometimes little children, were allowed to live: it was a safer thing to kill them outright to prevent all chance of escape. There was, as far as I am aware, no such thing as torture, and the suggestion that one of the infant captives might be kept and fattened like a pig against some future occasion was regarded as horrible: how would it be thinkable to kill a child that was already calling its captives *aja* and *mama*?[2] True torture, as far as I am aware, was never practised, though C. A. W. Monckton, as Resident Magistrate of the North-Eastern Division, writes: '. . . the Dobodura attacked and defeated the Notu, driving them from

[1] W. E. Armit, in *Annual Report*, 1899–1900, quoted by J. H. P. Murray in *Papua or British New Guinea*, pp. 331, 332.

[2] Chinnery and Beaver, however, recount an incident in which the Yema 'killed a Gilita boy named Omba, who had been captured when very young, tied him up', and sent the body to the Binandele (*Annual Report*, 1914–15, p. 159). But here the case is somewhat different. Yema and Binandele were in alliance against the Gilita, and the Yema had just received a present of a pig from the Binandele.

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

their villages and subjecting such prisoners and wounded men that fell into their hands to such fearful tortures that the Notus were panic-stricken, deserted their villages, and appealed to me for help.'[1] It seems probable, however, that this passage refers rather to mutilations than to an intentional infliction of pain, which, indeed, the oldest informants affirmed was never a feature of the raid.

Brought home by the raiders the corpse of the victim was set upright in the village, still attached to its pole. During the night there was dancing to the accompaniment of *bui* and drum—properly the largest and most old-fashioned of the drums, viz. the *ino*. In the morning the body was taken down to the stream and cut up in the running water, in order, as I was told, to wash away the blood. Various portions were distributed as they are in the case of a pig, and little odds and ends were given to the children, who played at roasting them in the fires.

It was formerly the custom, I understand, to set up skulls of victims on a *gaga* or small platform in the village, just as pig-jaws are to be seen nowadays ranged along a branch of an old croton scrub. The pig-jaws are mainly in the nature of trophies, though it is said that to throw them away and lose sight of them would have an ill effect on hunting thereafter. I cannot say what were the motives for keeping human skulls, but presumably the same reasons would hold good.

Tabus and Purification of the Slayer

The actual slayer abstained from eating any of the victim's body. This rule was rigidly observed, though no satisfactory reason could be given. It may be remarked that the owner of a pig never eats any part of it when it is presented to another at a feast and distributed. But this seems to be no more than a point of etiquette, and perhaps offers no parallel. Beaver, who lays stress on the fact that the slayer must not eat of the slain, adds: 'Small portions of the liver, ceremonially treated with symbolic herbs, may be *bitten* into by the actual killer;'[2] though of this he does not record any explanation. It is tempting to suggest that by this rite the

[1] *Annual Report*, 1902–3, p. 33. [2] *Ibid.*, 1918–19, p. 98.

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

slayer is assimilating some of the courage and fierceness of his victim, though it must be remembered that the liver is regarded as the seat of fear as well as of these more warlike emotions, and, indeed, it is presumably by his very deficiency in these latter that the victim was unable to look after his liver.

The tabu on the flesh of the slain applies not only to the slayer but to his father, mother, and nearest relatives. If they were rash enough to partake, their genitalia would swell, their joints grow crooked, and their heads turn bald. (Though in the case of an old man, it was said that these results need not be feared.) In view of such alarming risks it seems likely that there was in the person of the slain something like infection to that of the slayer. Other details confirm this view. The Orokaiva has a lively dread of *baupeni* (or elephantiasis of the scrotum) and swelling of the joints—both of which afflictions are seen in the Division. The slayer immediately removed his *bo*, or perineal band, and wore a leaf or nothing until he reached home and could effect a change of clothing: this was a precaution against *baupeni*. If he had dispatched the victim with a club he would straightway change this for another man's: on no account would he *shoulder* the club that struck the fatal blow, for he would run a risk of a swollen or distorted shoulder-joint.

Again the slayer must perform certain rites and observe certain tabus. He must not drink pure water out of the river, but only that which has been stirred up and made muddy by the feet of a non-slayer. He must not eat taro cooked in the pot, but only that which has been roasted in the open fire. He must abstain from sexual intercourse. These restrictions lasted for a few days and then the slayer ate the same purificatory stew (*suna*) which is given to initiates at the end of their seclusion (see p. 193). Among the Binandele I witnessed a mock demonstration of a peculiar rite which immediately preceded the eating of the *suna*. The slayer climbs into a small tree which contains a nest of those large and aggressive insects commonly called 'green' ants. The tree should properly be of the kind called *Bobo*, which

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

is always swarming with them. While he crouches in a fork of the tree, branches are broken and laid over him so that he is almost completely covered and thoroughly bitten. Having endured this for some time, he climbs down and eats the *suna*, steaming himself over the dish and sponging his joints with handfuls of the stewed leaves. Another rite (also performed at the end of the initiate's seclusion) was to break a coco-nut above the slayer and souse his head with the milk.

It seems likely that all these observances and tabus are in a sense not only purificatory but defensive. As a rule, informants have no explanation to offer, but I have been informed directly that they are meant to drive away the *asisi*, or spirit, of the slain man. In support of this view I may quote what W. N. Beaver has written: 'I am not disposed to the sole view that the killer is "unclean". It seems to me rather that rites are necessary to throw off the power of the ghost or ghosts of the slain. . . .'[1]

Adoption of the Victim's Name

There is a very common practice, already referred to in Chapter VII, which we may be tempted to associate with the same idea. This is the practice of adopting the name of the slain. A man, originally named Koga, for instance, has killed another named Amburi: henceforward he, the slayer, is known by the name of Amburi, the slain. This custom is very common, and has been noted by others, so that it is unnecessary to give a succession of examples. It does not follow that the slayer entirely abandons his original name, which, I am told, may still be used occasionally by his more immediate friends; but his ordinary name is certainly that which he has taken from his victim. When a warrior of distinction has accounted for a number of slain he does not take the name of each in turn, but continues, as a rule, to be known by that of the first. This, however, cannot be an invariable rule, for a certain Ehari of Wasida, who can name no less than seven victims of his own hand, is known by the

[1] 'The Use of Emblems or Insignia of Man-killing among the "Orokaiva" tribes of the Kumusi Division', *Annual Report*, 1918–19, p. 97.

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

727 551 name of the second. His original name was Ata; his first victim was Asi and his second Ehari. He is now called Ehari though he has since killed five others.

Although the stoutest warrior does not disdain to take the life of a woman, he does not assume her name. I have one case, however, in which the slayer gave the name of his woman victim to his infant daughter. The habit of bestowing the victim's name upon the child of the slayer (sometimes born subsequently) is again a common one. I quote an example by H. L. Griffin:

> 'It is a common thing amongst the Binandele for a man who kills a big chief to take the dead man's name, which he becomes very proud of; but my orderly, Constable Gisi-Gada, received his name rather curiously. His father, a Dauntutu man, went to fight on the Waria, and killed a big Waria chief named Gisi-Gada. On his return his wife informed him that she was pregnant. He was so pleased at this that he said that, if the child was a boy, he should have the name Gisi-Gada instead of his father. Everything turned out as desired, and so my orderly bears the distinguished name. But it was an instance of self-abnegation on the part of the father that is very rare in Papua.'[1]

This is a typical example, though I cannot believe that self-abnegation in general is very rare among Papuans; and the particular habit of giving the name of the slain to the son of the slayer is not rare but common.

519 551 It is interesting to note that in the case of an inter-clan fight (somewhat unusually fierce) in which two were killed on one side and five on the other, the slayers did not take the names of the slain. For this I received the somewhat bald explanation that the two factions lived at too close quarters and feared magic.

727 561 554 The usual native explanation of the practice under discussion is that the name of the slain is adopted as a distinction. It draws attention to the fact that a man is *embo-dari* or *mai-dari*, i.e. a man-slayer, and marks him, therefore, as one of valour, *koropahuso*, 'strong or expert with the spear'. It serves to commemorate his exploit.

727 551 Another explanation has already been suggested, viz. that adopting the name of the slain is in some manner a protec-

[1] Quoted by J. H. P. Murray, Lieutenant-Governor, in *Annual Report*, 1908–9, p. 23.

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

tion against the latter's avenging spirit or *diroga*. As we shall see, the Orokaiva dreads the spirits of the dead, whether slain in fight or dying in peace, and it may be that the tabus and observances which are customary with the man-slayer are in the nature of precautions against the spirit (*asisi* or *diroga*) of his victim. It may also be that by adopting the latter's name the slayer hopes to make himself invulnerable, because the dead would not assail the man who now bore his own name. This explanation, however, is merely a suggestion, and even if it be true, it is certainly not explicit in the native mind. Somewhat against it are the facts that a slayer of many men is known by the name of only one of them; that a man does not take a female victim's name; and that in an inter-clan fight the names of the slain were not taken at all. On the whole it seems that we must discard the tempting explanation (viz. that the adoption of the name is a precautionary measure against the spirit of the slain), and fall back on the simpler statement of the native, that it is in the nature of a distinction.

Homicidal Insignia

There is another kind of distinction, viz. the wearing of certain ornaments, &c., which may be described as homicidal insignia. To these is given the general name *otohu*, or the specific name of *esa*. The latter will be found more satisfactory here. The subject of these insignia among the Orokaiva is not so straightforward as we might expect, owing to the fact—a happy one from all points of view save the present—that homicide has long gone out of fashion, or at least no longer bears an honorific implication, so that the customs connected with it cannot be studied directly. The best written on the subject is found in the admirable article by the late W. N. Beaver in the *Annual Report*, 1918–19, pp. 96–9.

The source of confusion is in the fact that *otohu* ornaments are also given in connexion with initiation, where they certainly do not imply that the recipient has been a man-slayer. The concrete fact that they are given to girls as well as to boys or men is enough to prove this. Beaver

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

stance, at a dance in Petakiari, when a widow ceremonially discarded her mourning jacket of *baja*, or Job's Tears, she was presented with an *otohu* in the form of a specially decorated *bo*, and this with all the usual formalities.

In view of these facts we may regard the *otohu* as embodying a social distinction. It implies that its owner has paid a pig, or that it has been paid in his behalf, and thus the ornament has been formally and regularly acquired. Further, to the native who loves ostentation the *otohu* is worth having for its own sake, apart from any social distinction it may connote: it is a fine thing, for instance, to wear a 'magnet-shaped' shell ornament (*mendo*) passed through one's nose-hole and dangling somewhat awkwardly in front of one's lips, or to sit and rattle one's spatula noisily in the shell mouth-piece of an *otohu* lime-pot. In short the *otohu* has both honorific and decorative value.

It would seem that in Orokaiva custom as we find it there is no very essential difference between the 'pig *otohu*' and the 'man *otohu*',[1] or *esa*. They are of the same nature, but one is bought with the body of a pig and the other with that of a human victim. As we have seen, a victim's body may be used alternatively with that of a pig to satisfy social obligations, as, e.g., in the matter of a bride-price. It is therefore likely that a man who had a corpse at his disposal might equally acquire an *otohu* with it, and in this view it would appear that the homicidal *otohu*, or *esa*, was less an *insigne* conferred, *causa honoris*, upon the man-killer as such, than an ordinary *otohu* purchased with the body of his victim.

Against this view, however, are the facts that certain of the *otohu* ornaments assuredly do stand more or less distinctively as homicidal insignia, and that in conferring an *otohu* a warrior of renown always recites his past conquests and sometimes calls upon the candidates to follow his martial example. These facts may hint that all *otohu* were originally dependant upon the slaying of a man, the pig *otohu* being nothing more than a poor and unromantic sub-

[1] See p. 178; also Beaver, 'Homicidal Emblems among the Orokaiva', *Annual Report*, 1918–19, p. 98.

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

301 554 727 stitute. If such be the case, however, the change must have taken place or the substitution have been allowed in the very distant past, for we find that the well-established custom of the Orokaiva was to grant *otohu* both for human corpses and for pigs, and not only to man-slayers, but to boys, women, and young girls. So that an *otohu* together with the social *éclat* and dignity which its possession implies, is not only for the man-slayer but is within the reach of every one.

301 554 196 But the *otohu* with its social distinction may involve some social obligation. And this brings us to a discussion on the meaning of the word, which proves indeed a rather baffling subject. Beaver (who uses the Binandele form of the word, viz. *kotopu* or *Kortopo*) has said: 'I am not altogether clear whether the word "Kortopo" is strictly applicable to the act, the ceremony, the thing, the donor, the recipient, or to all of them, and, in describing the ceremony, therefore, the word may be used rather loosely. The Anglican Mission uses the word in the Binandele language to translate our "set apart", and therefore "holy". The sense, I gathered from my informants, was that of "superman", and indeed it is no great tax on the mind to connect the two.'[1]

While I would not deny that both these meanings may attach to the word, I still have not met them in my own inquiries. The only time I heard anything approaching the meaning 'superman' was when an Orokaiva, who had settled in another part of the Territory, gave *kotopu* as the equivalent in his language for 'chief'. The meaning of 'set apart' or 'holy' perhaps comes nearer to the results of my own questioning.

Adjectivally, the word seems to indicate 'well-behaved' in the widest sense of the term. It was applied to a law-abiding and amenable member of society, and perhaps the nearest equivalent in our language would be 'decent' or 'respectable'. The emphasis is certainly laid on the milder virtues rather than the more heroic. Thus a man was *otohu* or *otohu-embo* who did not quarrel, who did not beat his wife or children, who did not ill-treat his dogs and pigs, and who did not steal. According to one informant, an *otohu* man

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 98.

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

time during his career to take a human life, as if this were a social imperative, it is not too much to say that every individual aspired to be a man-slayer, and that his success brought him a great deal of honour.

There can be no doubt, however, that revenge was regarded as an obligation, though the obligation might be fulfilled by any one of the victim's group, just as the vengeance itself might fall upon any one of the slayer's group, and not of necessity on the guilty man himself. Vengeance with its expressive name *diroga-mine*[1]—'an exchange of the spirits of the slain'—may have had a supernatural sanction behind it, viz. the possible anger of the unavenged *diroga*, though I have never heard such an explanation expressed; but at any rate the unpaid debt of blood probably entailed a painful sense of inferiority which could only be removed by the satisfaction of killing one of the aggressors.

Needless to say there were no conventions of war, no gratuitous mercy, and no sportingness. Men—young or old—were killed; old women were killed; young women might be raped and killed or borne off to become captive wives; children were killed or made prisoners. Though, on the other hand, there was no gratuitous cruelty, the victims were not tortured; and captive women and children were treated with kindness.

Treachery, of which one or two examples have been given (pp. 166–7), was not regarded as contemptible, and according to Beaver, as we have seen, one kind of homicidal emblem was specially assigned to the slayer of a peace emissary. Towards all outsiders the correct attitude was one of suspicion if not always of hostility; a complete stranger wandering alone would be regarded both as potential enemy and good meat; and when visitors came in friendship, as at a feast, there was never any lack of warlike readiness on either side. The very cries of welcome which are so characteristic of the Orokaiva are possibly a sign of the dormant hostility between guest and host, being recognizable in one case at least as meant for reassurance of the former regarding the intentions of the latter.

[1] See p. 170.